UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/675,654	09/30/2003	Jeyhan Karaoguz	14282US02	5801

23446 7590 07/16/2009

MCANDREWS HELD & MALLOY, LTD
500 WEST MADISON STREET
SUITE 3400
CHICAGO, IL 60661

EXAMINER	
CHRISTENSEN, SCOTT B	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2444	
MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
07/16/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/675,654	KARAOGUZ ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Scott Christensen	2444	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *20 March 2009*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-42* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-42* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This Office Action is in regards to the most recent papers filed on 3/20/2009.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments filed 3/20/2009 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

3. On pages 16-19, Applicant argues that the limitation "automatically and without user intervention, initiating detection and detecting whether one or more of new media, data, and/or service becomes newly available within the distributed network" is not disclosed or suggested by Gnutella.

These arguments are moot, however, based on the new grounds of rejection presented below, and necessitated by Applicant's amendments. As detailed below, persistent queries were extremely well known in the art. For example, Gregerson, which was filed August 19, 1994, disclosed persistent queries, which are utilized to find files, data, resources, etc. that become newly available in a network after the query is initialized.

4. Further, on pages 20-25, Applicant attempts to traverse the finding of Official Notice taken with respect to claims 2, 3, 8, and 10. However, as detailed in the previous Office Action, and in MPEP 2144.03 C, to adequately traverse a finding of Official Notice, "an applicant must specifically point out the supposed errors in the examiner's action, which would include stating why the fact is not considered to be common knowledge or well-known in the art." Applicant has not addressed the taking of

Official Notice directly, or the logic presented with respect to the Official Notice. Further, according to MPEP 2144.03 C, "the examiner must provide documentary evidence in the next Office Action if the rejection is to be maintained" only if applicant adequately traverses the examiner's assertion of Official Notice. As Applicant has not adequately traversed the taking of Official Notice, the taking is maintained. Applicant should review MPEP 2144.03 C before attempting to traverse any finding of Official Notice.

To adequately traverse the findings of Official Notice, Applicant must specifically point out how the noticed facts would not be considered to be well known in the art. Simply because a complete search has been performed of the instant claims does not mean that Official Notice cannot be made. If this were the case, MPEP 2144.03 would state this, as Official Notice would not be able to be made in any case. The purpose Official Notice is to allow very well known features, which are "capable of instant and unquestionable demonstration as being well-known" to be addressed in a very brief manner, thus allowing more novel features of the invention to garner more attention from the examiner. Nowhere in MPEP 2144.03 is it stated that a proper traversal of Official Notice may be made by simply pointing out that a complete search has been made of the art. Rather, a traversal requires that Applicant particularly point out why the noticed fact is not considered to be common knowledge or well-known in the art.

However, it is noted that Applicant has provided more specific arguments with respect to claim 2, which will be addressed below.

5. On page 22, Applicant argues the rejection of claim 2, arguing that the statement "when a file is downloaded, the user should be able to decide whether the file is

processed or not" is not true. First, it is noted that this does not contradict the well known nature of "determining whether the stored migrated newly available one or more of new media, data, and/or service should be processed." Accordingly, this does not constitute a proper traversal of Official Notice. Rather, this appears to be arguing the motivation for the modification.

Gnutella is a file sharing program, which allows a user to search for content from other users. The shared content is not necessarily from a trusted source, which means that the content may include extra code that the user may not want to be executed. For example, it was well known in the art that pictures, music, video, executable files, documents, etc. could all contain malicious code (e.g. viruses) that automatically execute when a user processes the file. Accordingly, automatically executing the file immediately upon download, without some determination as to whether the file would be executed, would unnecessarily risk the user's computer system. This reasoning, however, was not utilized in the motivation statement in the rejection, but it is an equally valid motivation.

The reasoning that was utilized is that a user utilizing a file sharing program may wish to add files to a queue to download, thus downloading many files. Alternatively, a file may be larger, meaning that a download may take a half an hour, hours, even days, depending on how large the file is as how slow the connection speed is. Automatically processing files that take so long to download, or automatically processing files that are downloaded in a queue, and thus may be completed in rapid succession, would unnecessarily process files that the user is either not prepared to utilize (e.g. the user is

not present, as the file took long enough that the user left the computer system) or process a file that was just received even though another file just began processing, thus interrupting the previous file.

Further, Applicant's arguments appear to rely on a personal media device that has more limited storage. However, the claims as currently presented, do not require the use of a media device. The rejections, as currently applied, assume that a standard computer is utilized, where storage capacity is not as much of an issue. Further, Applicant appears to assume that the step in claim 2 must be performed immediately when the file is downloaded ("Instead, the newly available media is simply being saved and a determination of whether to process the media…or not…is made at a later time.").

However, claim 2 only requires that the determination is made with respect to the "stored newly available one or more of new media, data, and/or service." Thus, the step of claim 2 can be performed at any point after the file is stored, and does not necessarily need to be performed immediately after the file is stored. Applicant should amend the instant claim to clearly reflect when the determination is made.

However, even if the determination was to be made immediately after download, as long as the user has the option to execute the file immediately after download, the determination is still made, as the user has determined to ignore the file for now or execute the file. Accordingly, Applicant should also amend the instant claim to clearly reflect how the determination is made, what constitutes processing, and what entity is performing the determination.

6. Thus, after careful consideration of Applicant's arguments, the rejection of the instant claims under 35 USC 103 have been maintained.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. Claims 1-4, 7-14, 17-24, and 27-42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over "The Gnutella Protocol Specification v0.4", on June 3, 2001, hereafter referred to as "Gnutella" in view of Gregerson et al. in US 5,526,358, hereafter referred to as "Gregerson."

9. With regard to claim 1, Gnutella discloses a method for communicating information in a distributed media network, the method comprising:

automatically detecting initiating detecting and detecting whether one or more of new media, data and/or service within the distributed network is available (Gnutella: Page 1, "Query". The "Query" descriptor is used for finding media that is available on the network. Further, the actual act of detecting is performed automatically. Even if the user initiates the act of detecting with a query, the act itself is performed automatically and without user intervention.);

migrating said newly available one or more of new media, data and/or service to at least a first media processing system with the distributed media network (Gnutella:

Page 1, "Push". "migrating" is interpreted as being equivalent to transfer (See specification paragraph [0011], where transfer and migrate seem to be interchangeable).); and

storing said migrated newly available one or more of new media, data and/or service at said least a first media processing system (Gnutella: Page 7. The file is downloaded, which means that the file is stored at the destination.).

Gnutella does not disclose expressly initiating detecting without user intervention whether the one or more of new media, data, and/or service becomes newly available.

However, persistent query's, such as that disclosed in Gregerson, are very well known in the art. In Gregerson, a "Persistent Find Query" is utilized to detect the availability of a resource as soon as it is available in the network (Gregerson: Column 12, lines 29-41). For a persistent query, a user initiates the initial query. If the item being searched for is not found, the system automatically, and without user intervention, searches for the item again after some interval or in a continuous fashion. Thus, any new items would be discovered when the search executes after the new item appears in the system.

Thus, it would have been obvious to modify the teachings of Gnutella with persistent queries, such as that in Gregerson.

The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been that a user that wishes to find a file, and is willing to wait for the file, would be able to enter a single query, and allow the system to search for the item in some persistent manner (whether the search never stops executing, or the search is performed at regular intervals) in order to

discover the file as soon as the file is available in the network. This reduces the burden on the user in attempting to discover a file, and makes it more likely that a file that is hard to find may be found, as the system would continue to search even if the user is not initiating each search. Further, as detailed before, as recognized by a person of ordinary skill in the art, in a file sharing network, not all files are available at all times. As users are downloading files, logging on, and logging off, when the first query was made, no one currently on the network may have had the file, but at a later time, the file may become newly available, as a user on the network just obtained and shared the file, or a user with the file just logged onto the network. Thus, allowing persistent queries would allow a user to overcome this limitation of the Gnutella network with as little inconvenience to the user as possible..

With regard to claim 2, Gnutella as modified by Gregerson teaches the invention as substantially claimed except determining whether said stored migrated newly available one or more of new media, data and/or service should be processed.

However, Official Notice (See MPEP §2144.03) is taken that this functionality is very well known in the art.

The Applicant is entitled to traverse any/all Official Notice taken in this action according to MPEP §2144.03. However, MPEP §2144.03 further states "See also In re Boon, 439 F.2d 724, 169 USPQ 231 (CCPA 1971) (a challenge to the taking of judicial notice must contain adequate information or argument to create on its face a reasonable doubt regarding the circumstances justifying the judicial notice)."

Specifically, In re Boon, 169 USPQ 231, 234 states "as we held in Alhert, an applicant must be given the opportunity to challenge either the correctness of the fact asserted or the notoriety or repute of the reference cited in support of this assertion. We did not mean to imply by this statement that a bald challenge, with nothing more, would be all that was needed." Further note that 37 CFR §1.67(c)(3) states "Judicial notice means official notice." Thus, a traversal by the Applicant that is merely "a bald challenge, with nothing more" will be given very little weight.

It would have been obvious to determine whether said stored migrated newly available one or more of new media, data and/or service should be processed.

The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been that when a file is downloaded, the user should be able to decide whether the file will be processed or not. For example, if a user downloads a song, the user should be able to then determine if the song will actually be played (which would be processing the song's file) or just stored. This allows a user who is downloading many files or downloading larger files to determine when the file will actually be processed, and further allows security software operations (i.e. virus scan) to be performed on the file prior to processing the file.

With regard to claim 3, Gnutella as modified by Gregerson teaches the invention as substantially claimed except if said stored migrated newly available one or more of new media, data and/or service is to be processed, migrating said stored migrated newly available one or more of new media, data and/or service into one or more of a media view and channel view.

However, Official Notice (See MPEP §2144.03) is taken that this functionality is very well known in the art.

It would have been obvious to migrate said stored migrated newly available one or more of new media, data and/or service into one or more of a media view and channel view if said stored migrated newly available one or more of new media, data and/or service is to be processed.

The suggestion/motivation for doing so is that the media view and channel view are both interpreted as being user interfaces for controlling output of the media file. For example, if a song file is downloaded, the user interface that would be displayed to the user for play, pause, fast forward, etc. operations would be the media view. There exist many programs for doing this (e.g. Windows Media Player, Quicktime Player, Real Player, Winamp), and these programs allow a user to control the media presentation, and for many systems, these programs are required to access the media files (for example, to play an mp3 file, the system requires an mp3 decoder, which is not necessarily integrated into the system, meaning a user must use a program that constitutes a media view to access these files).

With regard to claim 4, Gnutella as modified by Gregerson teaches that one or more of a media view and a channel view is associated with said first media processing system (As the media view is a program on the first system (as per the rejection of claim 3), the media view is associated with the first media processing system.).

With regard to claim 7, Gnutella as modified by Gregerson teaches automatically migrating said newly available one or more of new media, data and/or service to at least a first media processing system within the distributed media network (Gnutella: Pages 8-9. When a specific file is requested, it is automatically downloaded (migrated) to the requesting node).

With regard to claim 8, Gnutella as modified by Gregerson teaches the invention as substantially claimed except scheduling said migration of said newly available one or more of new media, data and/or service to one or more of said first media processing system and a second media processing system within the distributed media network.

However, Official Notice (See MPEP §2144.03) is taken that this functionality is very well known in the art.

It would have been obvious to schedule migration of said newly available one or more of new media, data and/or service to one or more of said first media processing system and a second media processing system within the distributed media network.

The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been that the claim, as currently presented, does not require any specific requirements with how the scheduling is performed or that the scheduling is for a future date and time. A file is scheduled to be downloaded in an instance where the download is requested. Further, queues are very well known in the art, and allow a user to select more files for downloading than can concurrently be downloaded, where the queue starts downloading as many files at the same time as the system is capable of, and automatically downloads subsequent

files as previous downloads stop (e.g. download is complete or interrupted). The queue itself is a kind of schedule.

With regard to claim 9, Gnutella as modified by Gregerson teaches indicating said migration of said newly available one or more of new media, data and/or service to one or more of said first media processing system and a second media processing system within the distributed media network (Gnutella: Page 8, Paragraphs 4-5. The file is indicated as being downloaded when the system determines that the number of bytes that the file is has been downloaded. Further, the system recognizes if a download was interrupted, meaning the system has a knowledge of when downloads are completed, the knowledge constituting an indication.).

With regard to claim 10, Gnutella as modified by Gregerson teaches the invention as substantially claimed except archiving said stored newly available one or more of new media, data and/or service.

However, Official Notice (See MPEP §2144.03) is taken that this functionality is very well known in the art.

It would have been obvious to archive the stored newly available one or more of new media, data and/or service.

The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been that archiving is interpreted as being storing the media in a non-temporary fashion. For example, storing the media on a system's hard disk after downloading the media constitutes archiving.

Therefore, if a user wishes to have the file after the turning off the system, the user must store the file on some sort of non-volatile memory (e.g. the hard disk), the storing of which on a non-volatile memory being equivalent to archiving. It is further noted that other forms of archival (i.e. backing up) are well known in the art, where all of the data from a user's system would be archived to another system for storage and/or recovery reasons.

With regard to claims 11-14 and 16-20, the instant claims are substantially similar to claims 1-4 and 6-10, and are rejected for substantially similar reasons.

With regard to claims 21-24 and 26-30, the instant claims are substantially similar to claims 1-4 and 6-10, and are rejected for substantially similar reasons.

With regard to claim 31, Gnutella as modified by Gregerson teaches that said one or more processor is one or more of a computer processor, media peripheral processor, media exchange system processor, media processing system processor and a storage processor (The processor must be one of these, as the system of Gnutella is implemented by a computer.).

With regard to claims 32-35 and 38-42, the instant claims appear to be substantially similar to claims 1-4 and 7-14, and are rejected for substantially similar reasons.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

10. Claims 5-6, 15-16, and 25-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gnutella in view of Gregerson, and further in view of US Patent Application Publication US 2002/0194309 to Carter et al., hereafter referred to as "Carter."

With regard to claim 5, Gnutella as modified by Gregerson teaches the invention as substantially claimed except determining whether to push said migrated newly available one or more of new media, data and/or service to at least on of a second media processing system and a personal computer coupled to the media exchange network.

However, Carter discloses a system for synchronizing media presentations from a first system to a second system (Carter: Paragraph [0043]). The system determines whether to copy files from the first system to the second system (Carter: Figure 4, 404).

It would have been obvious to combine the synchronization of media systems, as in Carter, with the method of Gnutella as modified by Gregerson.

The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been that the system of Carter allows a user to synchronize a second media system with the media presentations on a first media system (e.g. the user's home computer). Thus, the files downloaded using Gnutella can be transferred to the second device so that the user may enjoy the media presentations in other environments besides the home computer (for example, the user's car).

With regard to claim 6, Gnutella as modified by Gregerson and Carter if said migrated newly available one or more new media, data and/or service is to be pushed, migrating said one or more of newly available media, data and/or service to said one or more of said second media processing system and a personal computer coupled to the media exchange network (Carter: Figure 4, 430. When the system of Carter is utilized with that of Gnutella, media files would be transferred (migrated) from the first location to the second location. The mobile media server can be considered to be a media processing system.).

With regard to claims 15-16, the instant claims are substantially similar to claims 5-6, and are rejected for substantially similar reasons.

With regard to claims 25-26, the instant claims are substantially similar to claims 5-6, and are rejected for substantially similar reasons.

With regard to claims 36-37, the instant claims are substantially similar to claims 5-6, and are rejected for substantially similar reasons.

Conclusion

11. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Scott Christensen whose telephone number is (571)270-1144. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday 6:30AM - 4:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, William Vaughn can be reached on (571) 272-3922. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/S. C./
Examiner, Art Unit 2444
/William C. Vaughn, Jr./
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2444